

DESIGN CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Wisconsin Department of Transportation
DT1558 12/2005 Ch. 84 Wis. Stats.

State Project ID 2697-05-00	Master Contract ID – If Applicable N/A	Work Order No. – If Applicable N/A
Region / Bureau Southeast	County Ozaukee	Construction Year 2008
Highway Local Road	Project Name Wasaukee Road	
Consultant Project Manager Thomas Lanser	Area Code - Telephone Number 920-924-5720	Subconsultant(s) SOCON Engineering ACS PEP Environmental
Consultant Name and Address Gremmer & Associates, Inc. 93 South Pioneer Road Suite 300 Fond du Lac, WI 54935		<input type="checkbox"/> Resurface <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recondition <input type="checkbox"/> Reconstruct <input type="checkbox"/> Pavement Replacement <input type="checkbox"/> Major <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge Maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> Brg Rehab <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge Replacement <input type="checkbox"/> SHRM <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Description of Work Performed by Consultant Roadway and drainage design, reports, agency coordination, PS&E		
Description of Work Performed by Subconsultant Soils, Arch/Historical Investigations, HazMat investigations		
Evaluation Period From 4/02 To 2/08	Percent of Project Complete Final X Post Construction	
DOT Supervisor/Team Leader Jason Roselle, WisDOT SER	DOT Project Manager Mark Wilfert, DAAR Engineering	Project Complexity <input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low

CONTRACT DATA

Type of Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Party <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Party with City of Mequon (Municipality)		Number of Amendments 4
Date Contract Approved 3/25/02	Original Contract Completion Date 4/04	Date Actual Completion 2/08

Rating of Structure Plans by CO Bridge (Maximum 5)	Average Design Consultant Rating - To nearest tenth 4.3
--	--

EVALUATION

1 = Unacceptable 2 = Below average 3 = Satisfactory 4 = Above average 5 = Outstanding

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- * Performance evaluation should be completed at least on an annual basis, more often if needed and upon contract completion.
- * Rate each of the five performance items on the following pages based on the evaluation criteria (1-5) listed above.
- * Indicate performance level by checking one of the options: exceeds, satisfactory or needs improvement. Consider the questions listed below each performance item and any unique issues where applicable.
- * Comments pertaining to each item shall be entered in the space provided below each item.
- * General comments or suggestions and comments from other specialty areas should be considered and attached if needed.
- * A post-construction evaluation should be made when necessary for design projects. Adjustments to scores and ratings if necessary could be made based on the results and experience encountered during construction.
- * Evaluation scores are recorded and kept on file in the Bureau of Financial Services for use in future selection processes.
- * Evaluation of subconsultant should be considered and completed as needed.

EVALUATION

1. PROJECT MANAGEMENT - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Note: Rate the consultant's representative you contact. Was the consultant project manager/leader in control of the services provided to WisDOT?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant project manager/leader assign appropriate staff to the services?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was the communication between the consultant project manager/leader and the Department staff adequate?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was the coordination with subconsultants and others involved in the project adequate?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.0

Comments/Unique issues

City Rating = 4.0 Comments: Considering the issues that came up, the project manager performed in a very professional and thorough manner.

DAAR Rating = 4.0 Comments: Project Manager exhibited good project management skills.

2. HUMAN RELATIONS - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was consultant responsive to requests from the Department and other reviewing agencies?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was consultant cooperative?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant react well to criticism?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was it easy to work with consultant?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was consultant courteous and helpful in dealing with the general public and agencies?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant effectively develop the Public Involvement Plan?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant properly represent WisDOT?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.75

Comments/Unique issues

City Rating = 5.0 Comments: In dealing with a particularly obstinate property owner, the consultant went above and beyond to provide answers and support. The consultant was very cooperative and courteous.

DAAR Rating = 4.5 Comments: Project Manager exhibited excellent human relation skills despite some unreasonable stakeholders.

EVALUATION

3. ENGINEERING SKILLS, Other - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant's services reflect good engineering practice?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were good engineering thought and sound judgment applied?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were innovative or original concepts proposed where the opportunity presented itself?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was the evaluation of alternatives and trial solutions adequate?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant work well independently, without significant help from Department staff?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were routine details properly utilized on this project?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.5

Comments/Unique issues

City Rating = 5.0 Comments: **Unique drainage problems were addressed with innovative solutions and sound engineering judgement. Alternatives were presented and evaluated throughout the design of the project.**

DAAR Rating = 4.0 **Design firm displayed and employed good engineering skills.**

4. QUALITY OF WORK - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the product reflect compliance with FDM procedures and requirements?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was a quality control plan in effect and is there evidence it was followed?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were studies and reports complete and accurate? This includes surveys, quantities, estimates and special provisions.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was work well organized, properly presented, clear and concise?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were all PS&E submittal items (including plans) complete, accurate, and in compliance with DOT procedure in the FDM? (Make comments.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were errors or omissions, numerous, serious, significant or costly?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did project result in the expenditure of reasonable time by Department staff?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.25

Comments/Unique issues

City Rating = 4.0 Comments: Some information had to be added to the right-of-way plat to meet DOT requirements. These modifications were made quickly and accurately. Any other errors or omissions were minimal and were addressed in a timely fashion.

DAAR Rating = 4.5 Comments: **Quality of work from this firm is always above average.**

EVALUATION

5. TIMELINESS - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant keep the Department informed of project work and schedule status?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant meet final contract time requirements?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant meet intermediate submittal dates?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant make timely requests for amendments?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant submit PS&E items (including final plans) with agreed upon lead time to meet PS&E dates?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.0

Comments/Unique issues

City Rating = 4.0 Comments: Considering the number of agencies involved, and the issues that developed as the project progressed, the consultant's work was performed as timely as possible. Delays on this project were beyond the consultant's control.

DAAR Rating = 4.0 No comments.

Would you have reservations selecting this firm again for this type of project? No

Describe strengths/weaknesses and provide suggestions for improvement.

City Comments: The principal strengths of this consultant are engineering skills and human relations. The design work reflected sound engineering judgement and a common sense approach. Communications, response time, flexibility, coordination, and people skills are all excellent.

DAAR Comments: No suggestions for improvement necessary. Mr. Lanser and his staff are pleasure to work with.

Was this evaluation done at a face-to-face meeting? No



 (Evaluator - WIDOT Signature)

9/22/08

 (Date)

 (Reviewer - Consultant Signature)

 (Date)